YITP-03-75

On the charmed scalar resonances

K. Terasaki
Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502, Japan

It is discussed that a newly observed broad bump around 2.3 GeV in the $D\pi$ mass distribution can include two scalar resonances, and is predicted that a broad scalar resonance can be observed around ~ 2.45 GeV in the DK channel.

PACS numbers: PACS number(s): 14.40.Lb, 13.25.Ft

arXiv:hep-ph/0311069v1 6 Nov 2003

Recently, it has been reported that a charmed scalar resonance $D_0^0(2.31)$ with a mass 2308 ± 60 MeV and a width 279 ± 99 MeV has been observed [1], and has been suggested that it is an ordinary ${}^3P_0$ $\{c\bar{u}\}$ meson.

If it is the case, it can be compared with the K_0^* which has been considered as the ${}^3P_0$ $\{n\bar{s}\}$, $(n = u,\, d)$, state [2]. However, the resulting width is much narrower than the observed one as seen later. In addition, its strange counterpart is expected to be observed around ~ 2.4 GeV from a quark counting with the mass difference $\Delta m_s = m_s - m_n \simeq 0.1$ GeV, $(n = u,\, d)$, as a broad resonance since its mass is higher than the DK threshold. However, such a resonance has not been confirmed. Therefore, another option might be to assign the $D_0(2.31)$ to the non-strange counterpart of the previously observed $D_{s0}^+(2.32)$ [3, 4, 5] which has been assigned to various hadron states [6, 7, 8, 9]. However, the mass of the $D_{s0}^+(2.32)$ is very close to that of the non-strange $D_0(2.31)$ under consideration although the $D_{s0}^+(2.32)$ is expected to be heavier by $\Delta m_s \simeq 0.1$ GeV than the non-strange $D_0(2.31)$ since the former contains an s quark. For example, it might be assigned to the lighter class of the scalar four-quark $\hat{D}_0 \sim [cn][\bar{u}\bar{d}]$ meson as the $D_{s0}^+(2.32)$ has been assigned to the $I_3 = 0$ component, $\hat{F}_I^+$, of the iso-triplet $\hat{F}_I \sim [cn][\bar{s}\bar{n}]$ mesons [6, 7, 8], where the square brackets implies anti-symmetry with respect to the exchange of the flavors between them. In this case, however, its width should be much narrower [7, 8] than the measured width of the $D_0(2.31)$ because of the small overlapping of the wave functions between the parent scalar four-quark meson and the final two pseudoscalar meson states with respect to the color and spin [10]. In this way, it is seen that the properties of the $D_0(2.31)$ and the $D_{s0}^+(2.32)$ are very much different from each other, and is suspected that the quark content of the $D_0(2.31)$ is much different from the one of $D_{s0}^+(2.32)$ and there coexist two resonances with different structure in the region of the broad bump. In this short note, therefore, we will demonstrate that, in the region of the very broad $D_0(2.31)$ bump, two resonance peaks can be included, i.e., one is the ordinary scalar $D_0^* \sim \{c\bar{n}\}$ meson and the other is the scalar four-quark $\hat{D} \sim [cn][\bar{u}\bar{d}]$ meson with a narrow width, although the BELLE collaboration have assumed an amplitude which includes only one scalar resonance in addition to the other resonances with different spins [1]. Besides, we study the strange counterpart D_{s0}^{*+} of the D_0^*.

We start with the general form of decay rate,

$$\Gamma(A \to B + \pi) = \left(\frac{1}{2J_A + 1}\right)\left(\frac{q_c}{8\pi m_A^2}\right) \times \sum_{spins} |M(A \to B + \pi)|^2, \qquad (1)$$

for a two body decay, $A(\mathbf{p}) \to B(\mathbf{p}') + \pi(\mathbf{q})$, where J_A, q_c and $M(A \to B + \pi)$ denote the spin of the parent A, the center-of-mass momentum of the final B and π mesons, and the decay amplitude, respectively. To calculate the amplitude, we use the PCAC (partially conserved axial-vector current) hypothesis and a hard pion approximation in the infinite momentum frame (IMF), i.e., $\mathbf{p} \to \infty$ [11]. In this approximation, the amplitude is evaluated at a little unphysical point, i.e., $m_\pi^2 \to 0$, and is approximately given by

$$M(A \to B + \pi) \simeq \left(\frac{m_A^2 - m_B^2}{f_\pi}\right)\langle B|A_{\bar{\pi}}|A\rangle, \qquad (2)$$

where A_π is the axial counterpart of the isospin, $I(= V_\pi)$. The *asymptotic matrix element* of A_π (matrix elements of A_π taken between single hadron states with infinite momentum), $\langle B|A_\pi|A\rangle$, gives the dimensionless $AB\pi$ coupling strength.

We now consider the $K_0^* \to K\pi$ decays and estimate the size of the asymptotic matrix element of A_π, where the K_0^* has been considered as the ${}^3P_0$ $\{n\bar{s}\}$, $(n = u, d)$, state. Substituting the measured values [12], $\Gamma(K_0^* \to all) = 294 \pm 23$ MeV and $\mathrm{Br}(K_0^* \to K\pi) = 93 \pm 10$ %, into Eq.(1) and using Eq.(2), we obtain

$$|\langle K^+|A_{\pi^+}|K_0^{*0}\rangle| \simeq 0.29, \qquad (3)$$

where we have used the iso-spin $SU_I(2)$ symmetry which is always assumed in this short note.

Next, we consider the newly observed $D_0(2.31) \to D\pi$ decay. Insertion of the measured mass $\simeq 2.31$ GeV and width $\simeq 280$ MeV [1] into Eq.(1) and use of Eq.(2) with the $SU_I(2)$ symmetry lead to $|\langle D^+|A_{\pi^+}|D_0^0(2.31)\rangle| \simeq 0.58$. It is too big. It is larger by about factor two than the $|\langle K^+|A_{\pi^+}|K_0^{*0}\rangle|$, although (*asymptotic*) $SU_f(4)$ symmetry (roughly speaking, $SU_f(4)$ symmetry of asymptotic matrix elements) would predict [11, 13]

$$\langle D^+|A_{\pi^+}|D_0^0(2.31)\rangle = \langle K^+|A_{\pi^+}|K_0^{*0}\rangle, \qquad (4)$$

if the $D_0(2.31)$ were a pure two-quark system, $D_0(2.31) \sim \{c\bar{n}\}$, $(n = u,\, d)$, as the $K_0^* \sim \{n\bar{s}\}$ mentioned before. (Asymptotic flavor symmetry and its fruitful results were reviewed in Ref. [11].) The measure of the (asymptotic) flavor symmetry breaking is given by the form factor $f_+(0)$ of related vector current. The estimated values of $f_+(0)$'s of charm changing currents have been compiled in Ref. [14] as

$$\begin{aligned}
f_+^{(\bar{K}D)}(0) &\simeq 0.75 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.02, && \\
\frac{f_+^{(\pi D)}(0)}{f_+^{(\bar{K}D)}(0)} &\simeq 1.0^{+0.3}_{-0.2} \pm 0.4, && \text{[Mark III]}, \\
&\simeq 1.3 \pm 0.2 \pm 0.1, && \text{[CLEO]}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The above values suggest that the (asymptotic) flavor $SU_f(3)$ symmetry works considerably well while the $SU_f(4)$ is broken to the extent of $20 - 30$ %. Nevertheless, the equality of Eq.(4) would still work if the $D_0(2.31)$ were a simple two-quark system (as the K_0^*), since it has been obtained by inserting the commutation relation, $[V_{D_s^+}, A_{\pi^+}] = 0$, between $\langle D^+|$ and $|K_0^{*-}\rangle$ in the IMF and by using the $SU_I(2)$ symmetry and the charge conjugation invariance.

The mass of the ${}^3P_0$ $\{c\bar{s}\}$ meson has been predicted in the region, $\sim 2.4 - 2.5$ GeV, from various approaches, for example, the potential model [15], the lattice QCD with a static heavy quark and $N_f = 2$ sea quarks [16], the relativistic lattice QCD with the $N_f = 2$ sea quarks [17] except for the light-cone oscillator model which predicts 2.328 GeV [18]. The mass of the scalar $\{c\bar{n}\}$ meson also has been expected to be in the region, $\sim 2.3 - 2.4$ GeV, from the same approaches except for the Ref. [18]. (However, it is strange that the mass of the scalar $\{c\bar{n}\}$ meson has not been studied in Ref. [18].) Therefore, the mass of the $D_0(2.31)$ is compatible with the predicted one of the scalar $D_0^* \sim \{c\bar{n}\}$ mesons. However, the decay width should be much narrower than the measured one as seen below. To estimate roughly the width of the D_0^*, we insert the asymptotic $SU_f(4)$ symmetry relation, i.e., the one that the $D_0^0(2.31)$ is replaced by the D_0^{*0} in Eq.(4), and the mass ($m_{D_0^*} \simeq 2.35$ GeV which is around the average of the predicted values mentioned before) of D_0^* into the general form of the decay rate, Eq.(1), with the approximate amplitude, Eq.(2), and use Eq.(3) as the input data. Then the estimated width is approximately $\Gamma_{D_0^*} \simeq 90$ MeV, since it is expected that the rate for the $D_0^* \to D\pi$ decays saturate approximately the total decay rate of D_0^*.

On the other hand, we have studied the lighter class of scalar four-quark mesons, $[cq][\bar{q}\bar{q}]$, $(q = u,\, d,\, s)$, in Refs. [6, 7, 8]. We have assigned the $D_{s0}^+(2.32)$ to the $\hat{F}_I^+$ as mentioned before and have predicted an iso-doublet, $\hat{D}$, with a mass around $\simeq 2.22$ GeV and a width ~ 15 MeV. (However, the numerical value of the width should not be taken too literally, i.e., a width between several and 15 MeV might be acceptable since the width of the $\hat{F}_I^+$ as the input data is still not definite [8].) Therefore, the $\hat{D}$ can make a narrow peak around ~ 2.2 GeV in the $D\pi$ mass distribution, so that two peaks, i.e., the relatively broader $D_0^* \sim \{c\bar{n}\}$ and the narrower $\hat{D} \sim [cn][\bar{u}\bar{d}]$ can be included in the very broad bump of the $D_0(2.31)$ observed by the BELLE collaboration.

Now we consider the strange counterpart, $D_{s0}^{*+} \sim \{c\bar{s}\}$, of the $D_0^* \sim \{c\bar{n}\}$. Taking the mass difference $\Delta m_s = m_s - m_n \simeq 0.1$ GeV, we estimate $m_{D_{s0}^*} \simeq 2.45$ GeV which is compatible with the predicted values from various approaches mentioned before. The asymptotic $SU_f(4)$ symmetry can relate asymptotic matrix elements, $\langle D|A_{\bar{K}}|D_{s0}^{*+}\rangle$'s, to the $\langle K^+|A_{\pi^+}|K_0^{*0}\rangle$ [11, 13],

$$\begin{aligned}
&\langle D^0|A_{K^-}|D_{s0}^{*+}(2.45)\rangle = \langle D^+|A_{\bar{K}^0}|D_{s0}^{*+}(2.45)\rangle \\
&= \langle K^+|A_{\pi^+}|K_0^{*0}\rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Using Eqs.(1), (2), (3) and (6), we obtain

$$\Gamma(D_{s0}^{*+}(2.45) \to (DK)^+) \simeq 70 \text{ MeV}, \tag{7}$$

which dominates the width of the $D_{s0}^{*+}(2.45)$. The iso-spin non-conserving $D_{s0}^{*+}(2.45) \to D_s^+\pi^0$ decay will give negligibly small contribution. It is compatible with the fact that no scalar resonance has been observed in the region up to $\simeq 2.7$ GeV above the $D_{s0}^+(2.32)$ resonance in the $D_s^+\pi^0$ mass distribution [3], i.e., in our case, the narrow peak at 2.32 GeV in the $D_s^+\pi^0$ mass distribution is dominated by the iso-spin conserving $\hat{F}_I^+ \to D_s^+\pi^0$ decay (since the iso-spin non-conserving "D_{s0}^+" $\to D_s^+\pi^0$ decay is suppressed, where the "D_{s0}^+" denotes any iso-singlet scalar meson with charm $C = 1$ and strangeness $S = 1$ such as D_{s0}^{*+}, $\hat{F}_0^+$, etc.). It should be noted that the CLEO collaboration [19] have observed a peak around 2.39 GeV in the DK mass distribution but it has been taken away as a false peak arising from the decay, $D_{s1}(2536) \to D^*K \to D[\pi^0]K$, where the π^0 has been missed. However, we hope that it can involve the true resonance corresponding to the $D_{s0}^{*+}(2.45)$ or that the resonance can be observed by experiments with higher luminosities.

So far, we have studied the charmed scalar four-quark $[cq][\bar{q}\bar{q}]$ mesons involving the $\hat{F}_I$ and $\hat{D}$ in addition to the ordinary ${}^3P_0\,\{c\bar{q}\}$ mesons, D_0^* and D_{s0}^{*+}. However, the $[cq][\bar{q}\bar{q}]$ mesons are only a part of possible four-quark mesons which can be classified into the four types, $\{qq\bar{q}\bar{q}\} = [qq][\bar{q}\bar{q}] \oplus (qq)(\bar{q}\bar{q}) \oplus \{[qq](\bar{q}\bar{q}) \pm (qq)[\bar{q}\bar{q}]\}$, $(q = u,\, d,\, s,\, c)$, where the last two on the right-hand-side can have the spin-parity, $J^P = 1^+$, at their lowest level while the first two can have $J^P = 0^+,\, 1^+,\, 2^+$. Each of them can be again classified into two classes, since there exist two ways to get color singlet $\{qq\bar{q}\bar{q}\}$ states, i.e., to take the $SU_c(3)$ $\bar{\mathbf{3}} \times \mathbf{3}$ or the $\mathbf{6} \times \bar{\mathbf{6}}$ configuration. However, these two can mix with each other, so that they are classified into the heavier and lighter classes [10]. The former is dominated by the $\mathbf{6} \times \bar{\mathbf{6}}$ of $SU_c(3)$ since the force between two quarks is repulsive when they form the $\mathbf{6}$-plet of $SU_c(3)$ although the four-quark system still can be bound by the attractive force between a color singlet quark and anti-quark pair which is stronger by eight times than the above repulsive force. The latter is dominated by the color $\bar{\mathbf{3}} \times \mathbf{3}$ configuration since the force between the color $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$-plet quark pair is attractive and stronger by four times than the repulsive force between the color octet quark and anti-quark pair [20]. Neglecting the mixing, we obtain the lighter class of mesons which involve the scalar $[cq][\bar{q}\bar{q}]$ discussed before, the $(cq)(\bar{q}\bar{q})$ with $J^P = 0^+$, 1^+, 2^+ and the $\{[cq](\bar{q}\bar{q}) \pm (cq)[\bar{q}\bar{q}]\}$ with $J^P = 1^+$. Some of them are expected to be narrow as the $[cq][\bar{q}\bar{q}]$ discussed before but the other can have broader widths. Therefore, the four-quark mesons can have a rich spectrum and are very much interesting, so that the classification of the remaining members of the lighter class of charmed four-quark mesons will be one of the interesting subjects in near future.

Besides, the heavier class of the four-quark mesons are expected to be much heavier than the lighter ones, in particular, some of the heavier class of scalar four-quark mesons which consist of the light quarks can have masses close to the ones of the ordinary charm mesons, D and D_s^+, as predicted in Ref. [10], so that they can play an important role in hadronic weak decays of the D and D_s^+, i.e., they can give large contributions to the decays through their pole amplitudes. In this way, we can obtain a possible solution to the long standing puzzle in hadronic weak decays [12],

$$\frac{\Gamma(D^0 \to K^+K^-)}{\Gamma(D^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-)} \simeq 3, \qquad (8)$$

consistently with the other two-body decays of charm mesons [21, 22, 23]. The lighter class of scalar four-quark mesons, in particular, $E_{\pi\pi}$ and $E_{\pi K}$ mesons, which have exotic quantum numbers, also can play an important role in the understanding of the $|\Delta\mathbf{I}| = 1/2$ rule violation in $K \to \pi\pi$ decays in consistency with the other weakly interacting processes such as the K_L-K_S mass difference, the $K_L \to \gamma\gamma$ and the Dalitz decays of K_L [24]. Therefore, hadronic weak interactions are intimately related to hadron spectroscopy. In this sense, the four-quark mesons are again interesting.

In summary we have studied the new broad resonance $D_0(2.31)$ observed by the BELLE collaboration, and pointed out that the broad bump can have a structure including two peaks arising from the $\hat{D}(2.22) \sim [cn][\bar{u}\bar{d}]$ and $D_0^*(2.35) \sim \{c\bar{n}\}$, although the BELLE collaboration have analyzed their measured data by using the amplitude which involves only one scalar meson resonance in addition to various resonances with different spins. The $D_0^*(2.35)$ has been predicted to be rather broad ($\sim$ 90 MeV) by comparing with the observed rate for the $K_0^* \to K\pi$ and by using the asymptotic $SU_f(4)$ symmetry while the $\hat{D}(2.22)$ has been previously predicted to be much narrower ($\sim$ several – 15 MeV).

The strange counterpart $D_{s0}^* \sim \{c\bar{s}\}$ of the above $D_0^*(2.35)$ has been predicted to have a mass around $\sim$ 2.45 GeV which is compatible with the existing predictions from various approaches. Its width has been approximately saturated by the $D_{s0}^{*+} \to (DK)^+$ decays and has been predicted to be $\sim$ 70 MeV.

Therefore, it is desired that the measured $D\pi$ mass distribution around the $D_0(2.31)$ is re-analyzed by using an amplitude including two scalar resonances. It is also awaited that the D_{s0}^{*+} is observed in the DK channels by experiments with high luminocities.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Professor D. Cassel, Cornell University, for conversations through which this work was motivated. He also would like to appreciate Professor T. Kugo, Professor K. Shizuya, Professor R. Sasaki, Professor T. Onogi, Professor S. Sugimoto and the other members of High Energy Physics Group, Yukawa Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kyoto University for discussions. This work is supported in part by the Grant-in-Aid for Science Research, Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, Japan (No. 13135101).

---

[1] K. Abe et al., the BELLE Collaboration, hep-ex/0307021.

[2] F. E. Close and N. A. Törnqvist, J. Phys. G **28**, R249 (2002).

[3] B. Aubert et al., the BABAR Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 242001 (2003).

[4] D. Besson, the CLEO Collaboration, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 032002 (2003).

[5] K. Abe et al., the BELLE Collaboration, hep-ex/0307041; hep-ex/0308019.

[6] K. Terasaki, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 011501(R) (2003).

[7] K. Terasaki, hep-ph/0309119.

[8] K. Terasaki, hep-ph/0309279.

[9] A. De Rújura, H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37**, 785 (1976); M. A. Nowak, M. Rho and I. Zahed, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 4370 (1993); W. A. Bardeen and C. T. Hill, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 409 (1994); E. van Beveren and G. Rupp, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 012003 (2003); T. Barnes, F. E. Close, and H. J. Lipkin, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 054006 (2003); H.-Y. Chen and W.-S. Hou, Phys. Lett. **B566**, 193 (2003); A. P. Szczepaniak, Phys. Lett. **B567**, 23 (2003); T. E. Browder, S. Pakvasa and A. A. Petrov, hep-ph/0307054.

[10] R. J. Jaffe, Phys Rev. D **15**, 267 (1977); **15**, 281 (1977).

[11] S. Oneda and K. Terasaki, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.

No. 82, 1 (1985).

[12] Particle Data Group, K. Hagiwara et al., Phys. Rev. D **66**, 1001 (2002).

[13] H. L. Hallock, *$SU(3)$ in the World of More Than Three Quarks*, PhD theses (University of Maryland, 1978).

[14] Particle Data Group, L. Montanet et al., Phys. Rev. D **50**, 1173 (1994).

[15] S. Godfrey and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **32**, 189 (1985); S. Godfrey and R. Kokoski, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 1679 (1991); W. Lucha and F. F. Schröberl, hep-ph/0309341.

[16] G. S. Bali, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 071501(R) (2003).

[17] A. Dougall et al., the UKQCD Collaboration, Phys. Lett. **B569**, 41 (2003).

[18] S. -G. .Zhou and H. -C. Pauli, hep-ph/0310330.

[19] Y. Kubota et al., the CLEO Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1972 (1994).

[20] S. Hori, Prog. Theor. Phys. **36**, 131 (1966).

[21] K. Terasaki and S. Oneda, Phys. Rev. D **38**, 132 (1988).

[22] K. Terasaki and S. Oneda, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 199 (1993).

[23] K. Terasaki, Phys, Rev. D **59**, 114001 (1999).

[24] K. Terasaki, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **16**, 1605 (2001) and references quoted therein.